

TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 9, 1963
PLAYED ON DEC. 19, 1963

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Plans for summer work. Index work, new group on Friday.

The money question.

The value of making comparisons of Gurdjieff's ideas with other systems.

Elliot Nelson: Report on his study of the Zohar

Mr. Nyland: (In connection with points made by Elliot): The key as given by Gurdjieff. Why people sometimes cannot publicly agree with certain ideas (two illustrations). Examples of Gurdjieff's behavior in connection with custom officers; giving out candy; a 'stolen-car' incident in Paris. The lack of practical application in Theosophy. The first and second shock in the octave. Natural evolutionary possibilities if one had a long enough life.

Terry Owens: Relates an experience of separation.

Mr. Nyland: The neutralizer between two levels; its knowledge and ability. Development of master. Properties of the component parts of water. Separation as manifested in ordinary behavior; thinking two things at the same time; or singing and washing dishes.

TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 9, 1963
Played on December 19, 1963

Talking about summer work, you remember what I said in the beginning of the summer. Let me summarize just a few things of what I have intention, or rather what I would like to do in the fall because we have now September, October, November, December, four months in which we really, as a group, could work very well and start. And in order to bring about a certain balance, I have a certain plan in which every evening is more or less occupied.

Monday we will start again on Index. And those who have participated in that know a little bit what it is about and perhaps we can use some new people for that. Who used to be secretary for it? That was Don Varella more or less. I would like you to, whoever wishes, to call him and to see if you can spare some time. Part of the work for the Index will be now typing. It can be done at home also so you do not have to come in for it is the evening is not suitable. Every once in a while maybe a little conference so that we know that we are all doing more or less the same thing; that we are not at cross purposes.

Tuesday will continue as we have been at eight o'clock. Wednesday at six thirty which will be then, from that time on, a so-called middle group. The reason for that is that I want to start another group on Friday evening at six thirty up till eight. After that we can have some music so it will not interfere with that. Thursday evening, as you all know, how will we call it Terry? Tape evening under the management of Terry.

Terry: Could I say something about that? This Thursday night we are going to listen to the tape of June 11th which is really something extra special. I thought people might like to know.

Mr. Nyland: June 11th? It is special because it is the day before my sister's birthday. That's the only reason.

So then Saturday and Sunday during September we have some physical work for some of us. But, in any event, here is the whole week more or less devoted in the evening to anyone who wants to participate in work of some kind. Now it does not mean, of course, and you must understand that, that every person has to come to all the meetings. I surely do not expect it. Moreover, I think it is not useful. You have to select what you want to attend. I have no objection for anyone from Tuesday to come to Wednesday and Friday. I have no objection for anyone from Wednesday to come also on Friday. I do have objection to anyone from Friday coming to any other group. This is one thing.

In the second place, there have been several people during the summer who did come once or maybe twice and then dropped out for some reason or other. Any one is this group responsible for bringing anyone who is at the present time not coming, I would like to get their name because the Friday evening will be a little different from Wednesday. The reason for starting a Friday group is simply that I want to have a new group where I can put new people without disturbing the Wednesday evening too much since with Wednesday we gradually will go into a direction of adhering more and more strictly to the ideas and really talk about that as a task or something that approaches a necessity.

On Friday it will be a little similar to the Monday evenings we used to have a year ago, altho this time there is no restriction in mentioning Gurdjieff's name. We will mention him. We will definitely talk about work. But also in connection with whatever particular subjects they might bring up. And I hope it will be more and more in a form of a general discussion of subjects that are of interest with the emphasis on Gurdjieff. For that group I would like a secretary.

The secretaries for the other groups, Tuesday and Wednesday; for Thursday Terru will continue with responsibility for that evening, I want to make sure that both Suzanne and Mary want to continue. But if, for some reason or other, you would like some one else to take it, please tell me about it. Alright? Because it should not be sabbied out too long. If you want to do it, fine. But otherwise it must not go at the expense of yourself hoping that someone else will take over the burden a little. Alright?

Mildred: When does Friday begin?

Mr. Nyland: Not this week, the following week. So, those who have new people, they could come on that Friday. There are still a few new people who will come this Wednesday. Tomorrow I will talk about that for those people and we probably will make a little segregation out of the people who come or have come on Wednesday and perhaps they would fit better on the Friday.

Now, as far as Tuesday is concerned, it will become more and more a closed group. That is, I will not transfer people to the Tuesday unless it is really necessary. And also, more and more you have to consider for yourself that you belong there. This you must know for yourself. I will not be the judge about that. You must know for yourself that that is where you really want to be.

Now another thing; regarding money. I do not know if you all do or do not. Maybe you do not think about it. Every once in a while, as you know, I speak about it because it is necessary because we forget. Some people do not really remember. Other people may not really have heard about it. But, in any event, you have to understand that as a group we carry, at the present time, the work as we now talk about it. And that requires on our part, particularly Tuesday, the people who have a feeling regarding it, that it is necessary to continue with it, and

that all of us become responsible for the maintenance of the ideas ~~xx~~ as we possibly can understand them and as we can exchange, as we then know by experience, by our own application of what we get. And often, you remember, I have compared it to a research group of combining different results of ourselves so that all of us can profit by that.

This whole question of money is a very difficult one and I cannot say too much about anyone who comes and says, "I cannot pay" or "I can only pay a little bit." All of that I must accept because you are the judge. Your conscience is the judge. You know how ~~xxxx~~ you spend your money. You know where it goes. You know, on the other hand, that certain things have to be maintained, like the office, like a variety of different things that must come up. And also, as you know, I am responsible for it. And I have to have the freedom to know what to do with this money. It is for the benefit of all of us, as some of you very well know, that at times it is necessary to help carry a few people over this difficult situation in which they are. That responsibility is mine and solely mine. And therefore I do not want to have any kind of committee judging about anyone. If I ask help of someone to remind so and so and so and so about the particular question of money, they do it because I ask them. You have to take it the way they ask you. And maybe you object to it. Maybe they do not do it right or do it very well. I do not know. The fact remains that you have to make up your mind regarding the question of money for yourself, for the maintenance of the ideas as you understand it and as perhaps you wish to continue with them. If you do not, of course, things will fall by the wayside. But it is not an organization in the regular sense. That I want to avoid because as soon as we have anything that even smells of an organization, you rely on the organization and the accent of work is not on you any more. You think

that by simply helping to contribute to something that you already deserve a place in Heaven. It is nothing at all. This work means your own personal work. If you work then you gradually will have the attitude that you want to help it to continue if you possibly can to the extent that you are able and to the extent that you understand what it is how to spend to your money for different things, not of a spiritual nature, or of anything that might give you a certain value in your life.

You have to consider that. And I will not be the judge about it. I will take it whichever way you tell me, If you say, "I cannot do it", I will accept it because I am not the judge about your expenditures. I am only the judge about the correctness and the exactness of these ideas. That I have to take the responsibility for. And that I will try to the best of my knowledge or the best of my own experience or whatever it is that has engaged me for almost now close to forty years. So, based on that, perhaps I know a little bit about certain things that may be helpful when we talk about it.

So, let it be very clear. I will also say something like that tomorrow to the others. And all of us as a while have to understand that we are and could function also as a group, taking that as a responsibility. And then your own conscience will know what you can and what you cannot do. Do not avoid it. Face it as a problem. Be open about it. When you cannot, be open about it; really when you know that you have to say it in a certain way, that perhaps sometimes you may feel ashamed when it is not exactly right. Force yourself to be honest. No one can question your honesty. But they can question your hypocrisy.

Now, in the beginning of the summer, we talked about something that I suggested in order to help you to carry yourself over a certain

period which all of us will have to meet at the proper time. It depends on ones development. And there is no particular reason to say it happens in one year, it happens it five years. It is also dependant on how intensive one is affected by the ideas, how much one has been looking for something, what really appeals to one in the beginning and what is the real wish that one wants to know a little bit more about it. And also then, in knowing, that one finds by practise, that the understanding of that what it could mean in life also could be enhanced.

But I say that regardless of whatever it is and the intensity with which one starts, that curiosity and adventure and so forth mixed with knowing that certain things could fill a certain possibility, all of us come to a point sometime in that kind of work where we are disappointed and where we might give up the idea of wanting to continue to work. And it may be that you do not understand work exactly. Perhaps then you would do something about it. Or rather, you would like to verify it. Maybe there are certain other things that become of interest to you.

But when I suggested in the beginning of the summer to start to think about that what interests you in other different directions of religion or philosophy, it is simply that when you study that and when you think about what has interested you and in what direction you still feel that there is something that you could gain, that you start comparing it with what you know at the present time regarding ideas of Gurdjieff or objectivity or impartiality or, not even the question of moment, but the questions of concepts related to time and eternity, to joy and to bliss, law of seven, law of three, Purgatory, the meaning of the transportation of the ships, the six decents; things of that kind. That you place them in front of you

and you start to compare it with what has been your interest in, let's say, theosophy or other kind of religions, Christian Science, Subud, whatever have you, or any kind of scientific development, artistic direction in which you have to go and to start comparing it. And I have not asked you to report on it because that has been a question for a couple of months to dig into that, to find out for yourself what you could do. Some of you have done it. Others have started and stopped. It has been difficult. After three weeks I thought that I would publish or at least give you a list of different subjects that occurred to me. It was already quite a formidable list and I was going to append to it different references and different books where you could look up this and that. And then I decided I had better leave it alone because otherwise you would do it because I have suggested it. It has to come from yourself what you have done and what you feel that is of value of the ideas as compared with what you have had in your, I almost would say, in your former life.

The reason for that is this: That if you come to a point where you might consider either giving up or that it is not so clear any more, or that the initial energy has been drawn away, that you have not the enthusiasm which you used to have, then then such moments, at such moments you might come back again to that what used to interest you. And then, by way of contrast, you will see a little bit more of what the value of the ideas are as we now have talked about and perhaps, I would almost say, in all probability if you ~~stuck~~ still remain alive, that is, if you still show signs of life, really wishing to live, you will have to come to an understanding that after all where else will you go for information, facts, data, concepts of the kind we are talking about when we talk about the ideas of Gurdjieff. And perhaps, because of that, it will help you to overbridge such a period. I would make a categorical statement that sooner or later, wherever

and in whatever direction you want to go, if there is in that direction not the necessity of putting to practise what you learn, what you read and what you feel, if there is nothing that has to do with a possible application, a possible kind of work, and very often work against the grain of yourself and your own desires, then that kind of interest will die after some time. It will not help you and it will prove to be for you temporary.

It is only when you go against nature that you will have the possibility of acquiring something that can become permanent within you and on which then at such moments of doubt you can rely and come back again and get a new start from that kind of a standpoint or that kind of solidarity within oneself. So, whichever way you want to go, it is almost I would say immaterial to me as long as you remain honest. And whatever you will try to find in whatever direction you will want to hunt, if you are looking for something that becomes permanent, I am afraid that you will have to come to the question of objectivity, to the question of having to do something about changing the ideas in to an actuality and something where you will have to find your place based upon your own experience; because only on that basis can you even form a conscience within yourself. And fundamentally, that conscience is necessary if you ever want to be classified as a person with character or principle. Elliot, tell,

Elliot Nelson

I would like to report on exactly this task that you have spoken about. Many times in the past I have asked you personally a number of question relating to the place of consciousness, the relation of individual consciousness to supremem consciousness and a number of questions about Gurdjieff's system arose in my mind in certain terms like what is the real relation between this teaching and Christianity, for that matter. And things along that line: Why is it called

Esoteric Christianity. And there were other things. And one thing that bothered me which I also asked you, was the lack of explanation of certain sections of All and Everything. So, since I have been of course reading very extensively, I decided that with your task I would look into Esoteric Judaism or, you might say, Caballah in its essential form. And I went to what is considered the source book: the Zohar. And that book is quite complex. The system is, I would say, easily as complex as the system in All and Everything. Yet I went to this system because I myself was born into the Jewish ~~faith~~ religion. And I, thru all my readings, even up to this particular point, I did not delve ~~into~~ into, let's say, the hidden meanings of even Old Testament scripture. Now, on that basis, I started to read this book and I found out quite a number of things. I jotted them down so I have a set of notes. Everything in relation to the Gurdjieff system I found was at least equal in the system of the Caballah. Now, in some cases I felt it was more. For example, there is a certain new language almost the same as is talked about in In Search of Miraculous. Not also there is a relationship between All and Everything in some of its wording and concepts in exactly the same terms in the Caballah. This, in itself, was a clue to the connection between the two. There was also a number of psychological places defined in the Caballah in relation to the cosmological totality. And this enabled me to grasp a number of points of, let's say, parts not discussed of the teaching of Gurdjieff, in All and Everything. Of course, and then there is a three body concept. There is a three world concept. There is even a definition of the Soul of man which is a little different from the usual. It might even have a relation to certain other parts, other, let's say, parts not talked about in the teaching of Gurdjieff. Now, the practise of work, I am talking about the actual function of it, is described in the Caballah in exact terms,

almost identical but yet there are differences there which almost point to a slightly different orientation or a slightly different picture of, let's say, the function of man on Earth in distinction to what is taught by you or by Mr. Gurdjieff in his book as such. Now, there is also another thing which I picked out of that. And it seems that they discuss even a second shock or, let's say, maybe I am reading into it a second shock. And the second shock is discussed in this particular book in the form different from the way you personally expound it or as I understand the way you expound it in this group. Now, on the basis of my comparison, I found, for example, that the Caballistic system and the description by Mr. Gurdjieff of, let's say, one step further are almost identical. There is also a place where the ordinary personality characteristics, vanity, ego and so on and so forth, fit and actually it is described; for example, the mixed multitude that went out with Moses from Egypt and they had to be moved outside of the camp. Actually it is a summary of it. Essentially it is a summary. The concept of identification is very clearly expounded in the Caballah. And as far as the moon symbolism goes there is a very clear exposition of what is the moon outside and the moon inside of us would mean; very clear exposition of that. Now there is also an almost exact similarity in the relationship of prayer as described by Mr. Gurdjieff in Search of the Miraculous and how it should be done as far as that goes. Then there are a number of exact definitions of certain simple words; like poor, like ~~xxx~~ charity and they are given an esoteric meaning. For example, feeding the poor is feeding ones functions, in essence. And there is also a certain statement in the book that charity begins at home. You see how this relates. And also there are a number of cosmological places described in that book which also have psychological understanding based on, let's say, on our ~~xxx~~ understanding of the practical

application which I mentioned is described in almost exact terms. So, on the basis of this reading, I was able now, taking and making a summary of notes of my own fairly extensively and let's say, grouping or at least starting to group it, there are a number of concepts and processes which line up very intelligently into a system. And on that basis, comparing the Old Testament with these terms of these exact definitions of psychological places for, let's say, evolutionary places or places of being, levels of being, I went to the Old Testament. Well, the Old Testament is described in this particular book in fairly extensive terms. And this particular central Caballistic book works only with the five books of Moses. But there are the prophets, the psalms, and all the other terms also fit into some system. Now reading the New Testament under the same definitions, the same processes described in the Old Testament under this description came across in the New Testament in almost exact terms. Taking Bahai, the Book of Certitude, the same thing comes across spoken by their particular prophet, it is hard to pronounce his name. Also taking the Book of Mormon and comparing it also, exactly the same thing comes across and even the Koran, altho I did not delve into that extensively. I was up to my neck by then. Any way, these processes are all identically described and in exact terms. And therefore it ended up that it seems that I have, you might say, the opening of the scriptures. In other words, to be able to read the scriptures in the esoteric sense.

Mr. Nyland: You know, it would be interesting if one could have read all this without knowing anything about Gurdjieff.

Elliot: You cannot possibly have done that.

Mr. Nyland: That is right.

Elliot: The practical understand is the key to the whole thing. The practical application is the key to the whole thing.

Mr. Nyland: So that, you might say is a tremendous advantage as

Gurdjieff has given the key. Who has read the Zohar? Who knows about it? Yes, Marvin. Anyone else?

Angela Benix: I have read a book about the Caballah.

Elliot: It is very hard. It is written very complex.

Mr. Nyland: Very difficult to read.

Elliot: -?- because of relativity. They call one point on top Father in relation to, let's say, the point beneath it called mother. But that point mother is called father in relation to the point beneath it. And that is father in relation to the point. And then they talk about father-mother. And you say, which of these seven points father are they talking about.

Mr. Nyland: It is always the same.

Elliot: It is very complicated. No, it is not always the same.

Mr. Nyland: As long as you have the relationship it is the same. But if you are on a different level then of course you can compare that what is lower than that what is higher.

Elliot: Well, I am talking about in the realm of knowledge and which process occurs at which level that they are talking about. Now, based on that, a certain sympathy or a feeling arose in me for the people of, let's say, the Jewish faith who, of course, I happen to be brought up in the Jewish faith. And I went to a ~~parochial~~ parochial school and also learned words by rote, or stories, Biblical stories where they never even gave a hint of this type of esoteric, let's say, substratum underneath it. So, a certain sympathy arose in me along those lines. A certain desire to, let's say, to give or to convey things along that line. Then I felt that since that arose in me, I had a tendency to look up somebody modern who has been writing on this Caballistic level. So I went down to Samuel Weisers and I looked around in the book stacks and I happened to see a book published in 1950 by a certain Rabbi dealing with these terms. Let's say, to explain the Caballah for the, let's say, the ~~pro-~~

present day. So I made a point to buy that book and I read it because I wanted to see if I could determine by reading the book whether the man had an understanding of the practical knowledge or the practical application. I already know that -?- say a lot. But on the basis of reading his book I had a feeling that he did not know the practical application but I wanted to be sure. Thru talking about it to a certain number of people, I finally found this very same person who wrote the book and I got his phone number and I called him up. It was a Rabbi so and so and I called him up and I told him that I was interested and I was a student of the Zohar as such. And the book was published under the name of the Caballah Institute so I felt if the man really knew something that perhaps I could study under him. So that was another reason why I wanted to speak to him. I tried to call him during the summer and he was away and finally I managed to speak to him just last Tuesday night. And I met him nearby, not far from here. He is from Crown Heights in Manhattan and I met him and took him into the Horn and Hardart and we had a -?-. And I started to question him very extensively. In fact, I had reached a certain point where he had a little phrase on the back of the jacket out of Jeremiah which I could see on the basis of, let's say, the esoteric terms, I could almost pick out exactly what concepts were talked about. So I questioned him very extensively about his practical understanding of the system of the Caballah. And I determined quite positively that he did not have a knowledge or a practical understanding, let's say, of how to become awake as a first step.

Mr. Markin Nyland: What a pity.

Elliot: Yes, it was a pity because ... I will come to the pity part a little bit -?-. Then I asked him how come he printed it and ~~know~~ where he learned it and I went into his background quite extensively. He told me very openly about his background and that he had studied

under a man whose son now happens to be teaching in Jerusalem, a similar system, the same system, I do not know anything about it. But he mentioned his name. And he said that he had tried to get the teaching of the Caballah into the various theological seminaries and Hebrew parochial schools in New York City for fifteen years and that he had lectured on a number of occasions at various centers and so on and so forth. But at the present time he had had no luck in any of his efforts and presently he was not teaching a group of people. He was only, let's say, following it all by himself, whatever he knew on the intellectual level. And he recommended that I proceed on the better good type of area. So I felt sorry for a man spending fifteen years or so trying to convey something and I really knew I could not convey it at this point so I had a certain sympathy. He told me even point blankly that he was quite surprised that somebody would be interested at my age, even though I was not, let's say, an orthodox follower of the religion the way he knew other religious boys. And there was a certain joy in his, let's say, in just talking to me.

Mr. Nyland: ~~How~~ How old a man was he?

Elliot: He must have been fifty five.

Mr. Nyland: Did you tell him anything about awareness and awakensness?

Elliot: I questioned him on the point of I or the point of becoming whole or the point of becoming unified very extensively. And it was like there was no comprehension. He knew the words, he could repeat the words he had learned but he could not really tell you what it meant. Because if he could, I would have understood, most positively. So on that point there was, I felt, a certain real sympathy for him on that point too.

Mr. Nyland: You know that the five lectures of Ouspensky have been translated into Hebrew?

Elliot: No, I did not know that.

Mr. Nyland: And that In Search of Miraculous is being translated

and published in Jerusalem?

Elliot: Well, I don't know how many people will be able to absorb it even then.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, that is another question. But I would like to counteract what you said. There are some people in Jerusalem and in Israel who do know about Gurdjieff very very well. Even a man like Buber knows something.

Elliot: Yes, but he doesn't have a practical understanding.

Mr. Nyland: That is true and probably very difficult for them being steeped in Caballistic and all kind of literature of that kind, the Old Testament. -?- how extremely difficult it is for people who have been brought up with that to say a little differently.

Elliot: No, I don't think it would be so terribly hard if you could explain it to them in their terms.

Mr. Nyland: No, the question is that even theoretically they might agree with you, they never could do it again. Take, for instance, take two examples: A person who is a teacher, a professor at a school of economics in London who knows very well what it is that money has to do as a function in society. Professionally he cannot explain it in the terms he would like to tell because it would effect too many other people who donate to the school of economics in London and as a result he would be fired.

And take the other case which we know very well about Mesmer. Mesmer undoubtedly had quite definite knowledge and also ability. And his fight with the doctors of his time and how he was completely ostracized. So I think there are many reasons that people do not want to admit, surely not publicly; but maybe in their own way. Joseph of Arimathea, you know, visited apparently Jesus but only came in thru the ~~side~~ side door without anyone knowing and only when it was dark. So, even during that period he was afraid of public opinion and he would not say what he

wanted to say. At the same time, if a person like that, if it could be explained that the totality of their knowledge, privately understood, can be put in such a way for them that it all falls into a proper place, there are some people undoubtedly who would be interested. They may not confess it publicly but they ~~will~~ will see a certain validity to that kind of knowledge and then gradually ~~from~~ from that basis be willing to try to interpret whatever their knowledge in the new light of having been awakened up to that fact.

It is a very good thing what you have done. It is exactly that kind of a thing that I had in mind; maybe not as detailed as such a tremendous study of the Zohar. Whoever has ever attempted it, you know very well; very few. But it requires that kind of studios type which you like and you like to dig into it until you find out. But then the wonderful thing really that when that is there and so much information really exists which many people probably have come across and never could interpret, the same thing applies to whatever one reads in the New Testament. And you read it from a standpoint of the difference between being awake and being asleep so that then immediately many ~~thing~~ of the statements of the New Testament take on an entirely different meaning.

Elliot: But even above this unless you have, let's say, the code words or the exact definitions of the words, you do not even understand the New Testament even if you are awake.

Mr. Nyland: It all depends how much one understands of Gurdjieff. That is one thing that I wanted to say. If you spend as much time in trying to understand Gurdjieff as you have now spent in trying to understand the Zohar. But, you see, the trouble with Gurdjieff is that whatever is written in All and Everything is hidden. And it only can be understood by practical work. And it is not a question of even mentally trying to study it or even to ~~try~~. But only by

means of work, the practical application of certain ideas which then produce in one an entirely different state of, I called it last week, being. And from that standpoint many things start to open up with Gurdjieff that you do not even find in the third or the fourth reading. But you find it when afterwards, because of experience of having tried to apply objectivity or non identification or certain things that are of a practical nature in ones behavior and the actual study to find the truth out about oneself, produces in a person, during that period of work, certain things which he cannot get in any other way. And, because of that, his perception changes. And then, when he again comes in contact with the ideas as they are represented in All and Everything, He finds in it something, I usually call it, something which is between the lines, which he never has suspected.

So, when you make a statement that perhaps in a certain way the Zohar goes further than that, it may be that it is explained in certain terminology which, at the present time, is a little bit more easier understood by you than what Gurdjieff has said. He intentionally buried it. And he buried it very deep because he insisted that people, unless they dig for it, they will never find it. This is the whole point, for instance, in Gurdjieff's life. One could associate with Gurdjieff without knowing a thing about whatever he may have written or whatever he thought. And whenever one was with Gurdjieff he could behave like an ordinary ignoramus, like Ouspensky describes every once in a while.

I know very well by experience. Absolutely I have seen him in conditions with the custom officers, for instance, as if he did not know a thing from nothing. He was just as stupidly ignorant. "What, what is happening here? What what? ~~Something~~ Couldn't I ..." Absolutely idiotic, like an idiot. And because of that, it was his attitude simply, he not only got away with it, but the customs officers -?-.

A person who goes around in restaurants and has his two pockets full of candy in his overcoat and whoever he sees he gives some candy; to the cashier, to the waiter. "Take, take, take." On the street even. You say, "What kind of a man is this?"

I remember in Paris we were there one evening and all of a sudden, we were eating or something and some one comes, quite excited. His car is stolen. It was -?- and his car had been parked on the other side. And Gurdjieff said, "Oh body", the whole thing, everybody went outside. We looked and yes, there was an empty space. And in that car there was the second series, in the compartment, the trunk. "What would we do, what would we do?" Salzmann was there, Mme. Salzmann was there, the doctor was there, a few of us were there and so we went to the police, the office, you know and told them about it. And they listened to it and so forth. The next day the car was in the garage.

You see, this is what I mean. A person can, for quite some time, have a tremendous amount of knowledge but not wish or not feel entitled and even justified -?- . And there is in much of this, of the Zohar, certain things that cannot be told and for exactly the same reason that sometimes there may be a hint of what more is in there, exactly the same applies to what is in All and Everything.

Cosmologically, for instance, I have seen Gurdjieff, in the way he describes the different relationships in the universe, I think it is clearer and the place that Earth and the place of mankind and the fulfillment of mankind for a definite purpose, I think it is clearer than in the Zohar. As you know, I bought the Zohar.

Elliot: At this point I don't know, you see. My question about my position in the group immediately, let's say, after this point came very much to the fore. And the explanations of course of yours are very practical and I understand them and I also know what I can do and

I also know what my level of being is up to a certain point. But still there was something in me which said, "Why not try to communicate?"

Mr. Nyland: And I think it is very good. You see, I say it is very good. Otherwise I never would have given it as a, you might say, suggestion. And I am very glad that you went into it with -?- and as much detail and intensity because this is the only way one really starts to realize what is in Gurdjieff compared to something in which I always have been interested or perhaps my father and mother have taught me of whatever my bringing up was; that I said that at the time when I was in the formative period of my life has had a certain meaning. How can I, at the present time, make it appear as if it is the same or at least reconcile it? Or do I have to throw ~~it~~ away certain things that were very dear to me simply because I now would like to become a Gurdjieffite?

And I think, for that reason, it is necessary. And what I said a little while ago; that if sometime in the Gurdjieff teaching certain things appear which one must, if one wants to continue honestly in one's life, will upset a person to such an ^{tremendous} extent that he ~~may~~ almost will get crazy because he cannot understand many of the things that he has to see and when he honestly has to face. And he only will face that when he continues to put to practice that what he believes in and he knows that he has to put to practice regardless of whatever it will cost. It is like in many religions the necessity of sacrifice is essential. If it is not understood that ^{there} ~~is~~ is always a sacrifice necessary at a certain point, the religion has no further meaning. And you must know that because the Zohar talks about that. The creation of the world was a sacrifice on the part of God.

Elliot; It talks about quite a number of sacrifices and what they mean; the ordinary functioning in relation to higher functioning.

Mr. Nyland : And the preparation of oneself one has to give it. And the totality of oneself one has to give up and all the different habits and

so forth one has to give up.

Elliot: But this is only on the initial step of becoming awake.

Mr. Nyland: It is alright. The initial step starts already with the outside of the body. But there is more to the body than just the outside. The deeper I come inside, the more is lodged it in and the more difficult it will be for me to give it up and sometimes it has to be cut out.

Elliot: The very same with the -?-

Mr. Nyland: Exactly, exactly the same.

Elliot: Even the system of Plato.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, and there is no difference. There is no difference. Ultimately it will come to exactly the same thing. And if one has time enough in ones life one can follow any one, provided one wants to use that what is there in a certain form on ones ordinary life because the relationship always has to be made. If I study certain things and I enjoy them and they are in my head I will not get to any point whatsoever. But if I put to practise that what Christianity requires: Love thy neighbor as theyself, how can I if I actually want to do it? How do I not commit adultery without actually doing it? Looking at someones wife or whatever it is maybe. Where do I place sex in relation to the totality of all females? Things of that kind; unless I face it and I come to conclusions regarding it and I remain honest with it, I will never get any where with any kind of a philosophy.

But, if I do, then I find out for myself what I really am and what kind of an instrument I am and that sometimes I say, "I stink". That I must know because unless I lose myself I will never find myself. And this is true in the most absolute sense. It is not losing yourself a little bit. It is the loss totally of oneself. Then one is able. It is a question also ~~expressed~~ applied to the Zohar as well as to Gurdjieff.

Elliot: ???

Mr. Nyland: Absolutely correct. And if one wants to, again I repeat what I said, if you could read or have read, and it is a pity that such things are not being taught, it is the pity all the time. It is just as almost terrible to hear anyone in the Orthodox Christian church, Presbyterian, Unitarian even, altho it is a little too superficial sometimes, but Methodist - to hear expound what they think is the meaning of the Bible. And it is utterly ridiculous that there are perfectly honest sincere men who tell you all kind of dribble and you cannot %.. Elliot: You can't understand it.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, you cannot understand how they ... And then you understand how it is that I or many of us were brought up in that kind of an atmosphere with well-meaning fathers and that it is a terrible thing that when Gurdjieff says or Jesus says, "Leave your father or your mother. If you do not do that then you cannot follow me and you do not belong." If I actually will dare to say that my father was mechanical. It is a terrible thing when I have love for someone and when I owe him at least my life in the beginning and surely part of my education and then to come to the conclusion that he was mechanical and that he was, at certain times, stupid and not knowing; not that he was responsible. But at the same time that if I claim I am awake, the responsibility which otherwise I would give him now rests on me. It is this tremendously heavy burden of Atlas. And it is not a Welt of Schmerzen. It is everything that I carry if I actually find my place in the world. And then when I want to correspond to that place, then I have a hell of a time. That is how I know hell on Earth, not Heaven on Earth.

So, whichever way one takes it and whichever way one wants to reach it, all the time it is necessary to put to practice that what I know in my life. If my life does not show that I have understanding, that I am able in my life, based on the Zohar, religion or on All and Everything

or on Subud or on Theosophy or on Zoroaster or whatever, if I do not show in my life that I am a controlled person whom can do say and think whenever I have to do that and not to run away from it and select the right words and be able to control myself in my actions, in my feelings, that I can have my personality be really a servant to that; let's call it, I or something much prather perhaps I would say, to me Being which Being determines the level on which I exist, then there is not any value in anything that I pursue with my mind or my emotions.

Elliot: I understand. And, you see, I felt that coming across this, that I could almost leave Gurdjieff at this point because, let's say, I can read now the New Testament in its other form.

Mr. Nyland: You can leave Gurdjieff any time. When you want to continue to make the effort to be awake, you can leave him any time. You have absolutely no need for All and Everything. At the present time we know what is required. That is, to come to oneself, to relax and to be aware of oneself as I manifest in the different functions physically, emotionally and intellectually. That is all I have to know. That is the key. This is the one prescription and that, if I do it, I said it the other day, if I did it concentratedly I would be a conscious man tomorrow morning.

Now, that I cannot do it is dependant on many other things of course. As long as I still breathe in air, I have said it several times, I breathe in subjectivity. It is an unfortunate, a God damned unfortunate thing. But I am still dependant, when I have this body, on air. And air, I drink it in, oxygen and nitrogen and so called subjective impressions which go into me. And ~~xxxxx~~ with air I can also drink in something else, I can take in something else of a different kind of quality. But as far as impressions are concerned, I am dependant on my subjective recording apparatuses as my sense organs. And as far

ordinary food is concerned, that we do not even talk about because it is filled with subjectivity. It is filled, not only with ordinary good nice food out of which life has gone, unfortunately, but we have in addition an awful lot of DDT, etc. etc..

So you see, as long as I remain subject to that, I will remain a human being. ~~xxx~~ The reason why at times it is possible that one is not bothered by it is that one has reached a certain freedom of Si Do. The Si Do is the inner shock that the Zohar talks about. It is absolutely essential for the inner shock to be administered but I make it. It is not conditions any more.

Elliot: Consciousness can produce it.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, that is right, Consciousness can gradually produce it. The consciousness starts already at the Do of the impressions scale. And by making the Do into the Intellectual Body, only at the top of Si Do of Intellectual is the fulfillment of Si Do of physical scale. Not before.

Elliot: Because they talk about feeding from above and feeding from below.

Mr. Nyland: That is the difference between the conscious area and the unconscious. Many of the things in the Zohar can be explained very well.

Elliot: It is the second shock -?-

Mr. Nyland: The second shock is Si Do. That means after the second shock, if one survives, one is free.

Elliot: With enough time I thought.

Mr. Nyland: ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ No, it is not the time.

Elliot: Well, they define quite plausibly that the only thing which give stability to the first shock is the second shock.

Mr. Nyland: Of course that is true. You cannot have the first shock unless you have already the second shock. It is an interesting thing. You remember I have Do, Si-Do, Fa. One, three, two. It is the only way by which this operates. If one can understand it, one already

knows that in Do there is the higher Do. Therefore the whole octave is there and all I have to do is to fill it in. And that gradually time will help me, my body will definitely help me to get rid gradually of all the things that I now call that what binds me, habits included, self love, vanity and all the rest; simply that means that by ~~meditation~~ fighting, by constantly pouring in impressions and trying to wake up that the material that is then formed in me gradually will loosen up the bondage between Si and Do. And that there is a certain moment at which I can actually say, "I am free." That moment is a shock because with this freedom I do not know what to do. This is the terrible shock. One finds oneself at a moment free, and then, what is the task? I am ~~xxx~~ thru with life and I am ready to die. And still, I do not die. This is something very terrible.

Elliot: That is very hard.

Mr. Wyland: It is very terrible. I tell you it is out of this world. And it is then that one realizes I am still in this world. And then the task really starts because then the task is one is already outside and must come back and submit that what one is to that what one is not any longer and then the responsibility of maintaining. I know very well. I know what the Si Do means. I know the freedom. I know the freedom of fear, absolute freedom from fear and still one is alive. This is the difference between permanency and temporary. The permanency can only be reached after the Fa is overbridged and then the Sol La Si will become -?-.

But continue with it. You read with it. You read into it what you wish, even if it may not be there. You interpret it the way you want to. You can understand it. Work with it. Use whatever there is for your benefit and go against your nature. That is, after all, the whole point. Everything that I am interested in, in let's call it,

theosophy. I came across Annie Besant's book recently. You know, a little bit of Blavatsky. Every once in a while I turn over the book and I -?-. And then I look at it and say "What kind of dribble?" There I sit in front of it, so-called Theosophy, the philosophy or the knowledge of Theos, God - and the nonsense; without any possible application, without anything that will help me, I say it often, to help me to buy a bottle of milk or a quart of milk tomorrow morning at the grocery store. And there where am I at that moment when I even hand over a couple of pennies? What is there that happens to me at that time? Rather engaged or identified or have I still the possibility of being, for myself, without that kind of ~~ident~~ identification? And if I read Theosophy, Annie Besant or Blavatsky, the Secret Doctrine, and even if there is something that I feel that there are treasures and I have to dig it out and I cannot find it. Then I finally say, "Why throw all this kind of time that I would have to spend in order to find it?" If I had the life of Methuselah I could find it, surely. If I could do it easy, I would not ~~xxx~~ care. If I know that I would live long enough, surely everything ~~xxx~~ I would find out in my life because my maturity gradually will teach me to get free from life. Certainly I know how, if I could live long enough, how to become mature; it is to experience, to continue to have relationships here and there and to hope that I will have life, sufficient interest to want to continue with my life. Then the age of seventy has nothing to do with it any more. Two hundred and surely I will become conscious.

This is absolutely true because the evolution would take care of that even in a normal state. Exactly the same way on a different kind of a scale, the Earth ultimately will become a planet. But, you see, these ideas of involution and evolution and so forth are not so clear in the Zohar. They are clear in Gurdjieff, very clear. Organic kingdom, the reason why man was born, and the upside downness, things

are not the way -?/?- otherwise. Not in the Zohar.

Elliot: It is not even in Christianity.

Mr. Nyland: Ah, but it is in Gurdjieff.

Elliot: (? Yes, there are certain things Gurdjieff has very strong?)

Now I want to ask one more question in relation to my desire to convey this. I do not know at this point where I should proceed or whether I should stay.

Mr. Nyland: Make your resume. It is very good. Make your resume. That will make you think again by comparing it to certain statements in one or the other. You can even make two columns or rather make notes on the side if you want to.

Elliot: ??

Mr. Nyland: Yes, but you have to boil it down to essentials. You have to boil down the Zohar -?- five books -?- and still there are certain things that I, let's say, regarding Gurdjieff that were put almost on a -?-

Elliot: I would say that what Gurdjieff says is essentially, you might say, it is almost the Zohar.

Mr. Nyland: Boil it down. Boil it down. But now in the terminology of the Zohar, not in the terminology of Gurdjieff. And then compare it.

Elliot: That's what I have ~~since~~ been doing, side by side.

Mr. Nyland: This is what I would do. I would continue with it.

Elliot: My inclination right now is to stand still.

Mr. Nyland: No. no.

Elliot: No, I mean continue the way I am going but not to go, let's say, externally and things like that.

Mr. Nyland: If you want to do it and you want to do it intellectually, you put on yourself an obligation that everything you write down you try to put to practise.

Elliot: There are certain things that you write down that are just impossible.

Mr. Nyland: I know it. The question is you do what you can as far as practise is concerned. Then after, you will give yourself a rule: I will not write down unless I practise. And this is one of the most marvelous things that could happen to you. Let's say it is an obligation of a teacher: Not to talk about anything unless it is the result of one's experience.

Elliot: But that means already one can talk about a lot.

Mr. Nyland: I hope so, I hope so. No body will ever object to it. So do not sit ~~talk~~ still and idle. Keep busy. Work in the vineyard of the Lord.

Terry Owens: I would like you r help with an experience that I have been having. It is an experience in a moment of being awake in which the quality or the characteristic of as if outside is particularly strong. I could describe it as tho the observer is at the end of a very powerful rubberband which is then snapped back very abruptly. It is like I go zooming in and out in a way.

Mr. Nyland: Who is doing the snapping back?

Terry: That is where my question is really.

Mr. Nyland: No, never mind the snapping. Let's take the separation. What is behind the separation?

Terry: In words?

Mr. ~~Nyland~~ Nyland: What is it that motivates the wish to separate? One can have an experience of separation almost accidentally. And one says, "Yes I know -?- . I see it very well. I am interested one way." Sometimes it is possible to place the accent on the other. This is the key. Something in your being is alive to the condition in which you are; separated or not. It takes an interest in the behavior form of your personality. It takes an interest of that what would guide the personality and uses the personality as a servant. So, it becomes interested in

in the servant who is in charge of the other servants. There is a master. I do not call them deputy stewards because they do not mean anything. It is the head, the one who takes the responsibility for a group and he always has to check that against somebody -?-. That what I now see, that what now determines the wish to separate, that what also tries to indicate to one ~~xxxx~~ "Here is the point of gravity and it is not where I want it; it is somewhere else where I want it." Then I say I of something of me of a different kind than the other two. But I do not know in the beginning that there is a different kind because I do not know about that.

So, the beginning is a third something which has relationship with the other two. Or rather, it becomes one and two; the two having the relationship between one and three. If I take one and three as more opposing than one and two, then the two becomes inbetween and the two starts to operate as if it is already independant. It reality it is not independant, because the two very often goes with one and very often can go with three.

The proper place for two is knowing one and three and not being identified with it. So, it is the beginning of that what I now call a neutralizer between the two things that are separating. But in the beginning that what is neutralizer functions as a force between the two so that it is a directive that is given to either the one force or the other force not to fall into either but to be in between the two and hold them together. That becomes the function of that what I call neutralizing force and it is determined by my wish.

Now, I go along for some time, I endow as it were ~~xxxx~~ that something of a different ~~quality~~ quality because in ~~reality~~ reality it is not identified with the lower or the higher. It is, at the same time, something that is a force. So, there is a relationship but it is not

identical. Neutralizing is its function; force is its principle. With the principle it understands the other two. With that as a force it understand opposition. Also, as a force, it understands attraction and it understands separation and attraction at the same time. It is something that that neutralizer already knows a great deal about and ~~it~~ still, it is of the same nature as the others.

It goes along now experiencing this as a three unity. Now there is a moment inwhich the three are one. For the time being that what is neutralizer does not know this. It cannot know because it is not inherent in the knowledge of knowing that what is a law above it. You see? But when it is a law above it, that neutralizer has the ability of being in the unit and remembering how it was.

It is interesting. Water has in it the ability of a hydrogen atom knowing that it is a component of water. You see, I must make that assumption. Otherwise there is not relation to each other. And it is really an indication that the level s are related together by an involutionary process. Otherwise they would not -?-. So, when I go reveraly up the scale and make, out of the three, ~~x~~ one - in the one there is remembrance of the past. Then, having experienced this as the two separation which is now between levels, not separation on the same level but separation of two levels, then from the higher level I see what takes place on the lower. And I see then not only two forces but three.

Terry: But I am not there long enough. That is what I want to ask.

Mr. Nyland: Alright, it is alright. That I cannot tell you. That is the vertical line. It is like a pole one climbs., but perpendicular at any one moment. But the pole is greased. That is what it is so difficult. But only a fervent wish inwhich all of me, at the moment

When I am at the foot of the pole, I am destroyed. And in the smoke of that destruction I climb up the pole and then I am away.

Who remembers work? Who remembers this week, actual work; that you made an attempt, that you fought, that you really understood that there is work involved in work, an effort; that you know that there are the tendencies in one direction and there is also a definite knowledge of the possibility of another direction and that you were willing to submit to both, to take, as it were, a stand in which both of you - that is, I say both of you, when there is a separation, also when the totality of you is subject to both. It is saying exactly the same thing.

Separation is exactly the same as the acknowledgment of two force effecting me. You will see it much better if you wake your ordinary mind when two thoughts are there at the same time. Also a little lower scale, if your physical body is doing two things at the same time that there is already a separation only you never look at it that way because you will say, "I am doing this and that". You may be singing and at the same time you wash dishes. You use part of yourself already independently of each other simply because you feel like it or you want it. It is really that kind of separation that gradually becomes so obvious that that what causes, let's say, your singing is caused by something else than that what washes ~~sinks~~ dishes. And that gradually, out of that, you come to the realization that you are effected by two different things. And then, when you ponder about that, what is it really that could be that kind of a difference, what could make that difference in me?

You come to a conclusion that that what really is something that you cherish is of a different kind of nature or a different kind of value. You call it spiritual. You call it more etherical. Sometimes you

call it higher morality. ~~Somekink~~ Sometimes you call it real ethics. Sometimes you call it essential. And the other is your ordinary humdrum existence. And you are confronted sometimes between the two things. Which way will you go? Will you take both? Can you take both. can you remain at that time, in our terminology, remain awake for some time as you ~~xx~~ proceed. And how hard then do you fight? How long do you hold onto it; that you want, that you really feel that it is necessary.

More and more work has to take on the coloration of a necessity, a real need, something without which your life would not be complete, but only when it is applied, when it is in your life, when it is part of your daily life, when your daily life requires it. It is rather a big step because in ordinary life unconsciously you ~~xxx~~ are very satisfied the way it is. Consciously you do not even see that your unconscious part is lacking something because when you are in the conscious state you are so enamoured by being conscious that you think it is all and that when you return you are unconscious.

If you hold onto the conscious state you come into conflict. Immediate-ly when you return to ordinary life you have a terrible time holding on to that what you -?- and still, you have to hold on to it if you want to remain awake. If you want to continue with your ordinary life you cannot afford too much of the attention given to that state of wishing ~~xxx~~ to be awake. And at the same time you are between the devil and the deep sea.

The deep sea for this is God. The devil is that what keeps you away from it. It is deep. You have to look for it. You have to die for it. You really have to struggle. What is it with the sea when you dive into it? The sea/^{itself} pushes you up. The further down you go, the more difficult it is to -?-. You know, your body is not used to be

under that kind of a pressure. And it pushes you up again. You know that in diving.

This is life. The more you try to introduce consciousness in your unconscious state, the more difficulty you will have and the more you will want to give up because you may not believe that it is worth the gamble. And still, you have to work. And you must work in a day, a week, in a month. Look at the four months ahead of us. To make a program I want to settle a few things. I want to settle certain things about myself that I know and either one way or the other I will want to settle it. I want to make absolutely clear to me that way, "I am master" or "It is mastering me." Select out of your forms of behavior just a few little things. They can be quite small but you must be intense and you must definitely wish to do something about your life. And every evening you must remember that.

Your life is at stake. I am telling you. I keep on telling you. I could tell you every day. You have to tell yourself every day. When will we wake up? When will we actually wish to be in a school that tells us in ordinary elementary language that we must wake up in order to fulfill our duty of that what we understand at times when we are ~~not~~ right; the times when we know, the times that we are willing to admit it; that we say, "That really should be my real wish."

Another week will go by and another week. It will be filled with a great deal of nonsense and a few good things. Increase the good things. Wherever you go, whatever you do, it does not matter very much where you are, you know. Maybe you were in Europe, maybe you go out to some other place. Maybe you will not have all the stimulus but for yourself something can be engraved. I suggested once to write up on a little piece of paper of that what you really think is an important thought for that day and to put it in your vest pocket or in your bag and

every hour take it out and be reminded. You select, like you once in a while could select things in little booklets, you know, a daily thought or aphorism or something that you say, "Now, a good little thought for two minutes and then my day is done and it is made." If you take something of your own, something that you know concerns you; not that someone else has said. Something of yourself, that you have written up. Maybe you have a diary. Maybe you have something that you cherish. We used to call it a common place book. Something that has little sayings in it that you remember, that you want to remember, that you said, maybe little children said, that you read somewhere, and you take that as a thought for that day and you take it out of your pocket and you look at it and you try to see it. You try to make a relation between that and yourself. And then, at that moment, you wake up.

Do not ever do anything regarding a task unless you connect it with being awake. If you forget that, all your tasks, all the accomplishments are absolutely not worth anything whatsoever and you may as well not do it. The task has nothing to do with the result you achieve in any sense with matter or with emotions or with my thoughts. It has only to do with the accumulation at the time when you do the task against the grain, with the grain, with the wind, against it, tacking or not, I do not care; but that you wake up to that fact that you, something in you, is interested in doing that task. And you do it and you see it. You become ~~are~~ aware of you doing a task. Then you are awake.

What does it say in St. John? I now see. I was blind. But now I see. That is in the Bible. Every evening, every morning, whenever you can during the day, for God's sake be serious. Do not let time fly or go by. Sit, come to yourself. Make that attempt. Be simple about it. Do not have any fear for yourself. You are what you are; be proud of

that. You have what you have. That is already the beginning of something that will give you strength and on which you will stand and then with that you work.

Work simply, day after day. Work. Do not forget. Pray. In the prayer the three different parts of oneself become fused and it is that level of being which has contact with God. And it is in that state in which the thoughts and the doings and the feelings again can become apparant. But this time they are colored by having been at a different place; the place of prayer.

Good night everybody. I hope you work. I hope to see you next week. I do not say Good luck. I wish you -?-